BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT

CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
ROSENFELD HEARING ROOM - FIRST FLOOR
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

This meeting of the Citizens Oversight Board will include teleconference participation by one or more Board Members. Per Government Code section 11123(b) (2), the teleconference locations, in addition to the address above, are:

Arup 12777 W. Jefferson Blvd. #100 Los Angeles, CA 90066

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2019

1:00 P.M.

Reported by: Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT (*Via telephone and/or WebEx)

Mark Gold, Chair

*Heather Rosenberg, Board Member

Barbara Lloyd, Board Member

Randall Martinez, Board Member

Adrienne Alvord, Board Member

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Martha Brook, Advisor to Andrew McAllister, California Energy Commission, Commissioner

Michael Murza, Law & Policy Advisor to Chair Weisenmiller

COB STAFF PRESENT

Jack Bastida

James Bartridge

CEC STAFF PRESENT

David Velazquez, Local Assistance & Financing Office

Elizabeth John, School Bus Replacement Program

ALSO PRESENT

Hoang Nguyen, California Community College Chancellor's Office

Sarah White, California, Workforce Development Board

PUBLIC COMMENT: (*Via telephone and/or WebEx)

None

INDEX

THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER AND MAY TAKE ACTION ON THE

FOLLOWING ITEMS: INTRODUCTION AND ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS 1. 11 TO DETERMINE QUORUM. (Chair Gold) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 3, 2018 2. 11 CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD MEETING. (Chair Gold) 3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON THE CITIZENS 12 OVERSIGHT BOARD CHAIR POSITION. (Chair Gold) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON THE CITIZENS 14 4. OVERSIGHT BOARD VICE CHAIR POSITION (Chair Gold) PRESENTATION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ANNUAL REPORT 16 FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION. (David Velazquez, California Energy Commission) PRESENTATION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ANNUAL REPORT 25 6. FROM THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE. (Hoang Nguyen, California Community College Chancellor's Office) 7. PRESENTATION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON JOBS REPORT 38 FROM THE CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD. (Sarah White, California Workforce Development Board) PUBLIC COMMENT 9. 80 1 Adjourn 81 Reporter's Certification 82 Transcriber's Certification 83

_

PROCEEDINGS

FEBRUARY 19, 2019

1:00 P.M.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And welcome everyone to the first meeting of the Proposition 39 Citizens Oversight Board for 2019.

I'm Jim Bartridge, board staff. I'm joined by Jack Bastida who's working on the WebEx here with us. We'll start with a couple housekeeping comments. So there's not a snack bar upstairs but there are some vending machines on the second floor. And restrooms out the door to your left over here to the corner. And lastly, in the event of some emergency and the building gets evacuated, we'll go to the park across the street, follow the employees, and then we get back together at Roosevelt Park and afterwards we'd come back here when the emergency is cleared. So that's the housekeeping comments. And let's take it away.

So each year at the first meeting of the Citizens

Oversight Board we elect a chair and vice chair to oversee

the board's work throughout the year. We also receive

annual progress reports on Proposition 39 activities from

agencies that report to us, including the Energy

Commission, the California Community College chancellor's

office, and the California Workforce Development Board.

This year the California Conservation Corps is not reporting as they transitioned away from Prop 39 funds to Greenhouse Gas Reduction funds last year.

2.1

Going forward we'll take the information we receive today from the reporting agencies and develop our COB report in the next two weeks or so which we'll review a draft of at our next meeting on March 21. Thereafter we'll finalize that report and submit it to the legislature by the end of March.

There's some recent changes to the board. Kate

Gordon resigned in January after Governor Newsom appointed

her as director of the Governor's Office of Planning and

Research. Vice Chair Gold is with us today. He then

assumed the duties of chair and work closely with us to

review materials, provide guidance, and develop today's

agenda.

Chair Gold, any opening comments?

CHAIR GOLD: Yes, thanks, Jim.

Unfortunately, I mean, we all would love to have

Kate Gordon here today to thank her for everything she's

done for this. And hopefully we'll have the opportunity to

do that at a future meeting. I think the Strategic Growth

Council is going on at the same exact time and so since

she's running OPR, it makes sense that she's there.

Just to give you an overview of what we're going to be talking about today, and a lot of what I'm going to go through is it's been a pretty amazing program in the five years for the clean energy jobs fund. And some of the things that we'll be talking about today in much greater depth include the fact that over \$1.7 billion to local educational agencies for energy efficiency and clean energy projects have been allocated which is pretty extraordinary in such a short period of time. And over \$220 million to community colleges for the same sorts of projects, as well as a successful effort on workforce and economic development. And then 26 million for energy surveys and other energy conservation activities. And then \$12 million to prepare ex-offenders and individuals from disadvantaged, underserved communities and veterans for clean energy jobs.

And so all of these projects going on which we're going to spend, we're going to go through these impressive reports on, we're probably going to see project spend out on where completion of the projects by the end of 2020.

And from the standpoint of allocation of resources, there's really no more resources to allocate. And so really this is truly an oversight from the standpoint of just making

sure that everything is going well and that we're having progress on efforts to date. And so whether or not we end up having discussions which I hope we will have in the coming meetings about on whether there's other opportunities to keep this successful program going and how that would make sense, I look forward to those discussions in the near future.

2.1

All right. So with Kate's recent departure, we're now down to six board members just to let you know. And then we hope to have additional appointments from the state treasurer and attorney general's office in the near future.

And also a note for future discussion related to what I just said is that despite program funding ending in 2018, Senate Bill 110 from 2017 extended the overall program but with significant changes, including removing the direct allocation of funds collected from Proposition 39 tax change. So in the future, the program will only be funded via appropriations. So like I said, at future meetings we'll be discussing what the potential opportunities from moving that along.

Next, I'd like to thank Chair Weisenmiller's advisor Michael Murza and I'm not sure if Commissioner -- nope. And I think Michael's got an announcement to make.

MR. MUZA: Thanks. Yeah, I'd like to make -- read a statement on Chair Weisenmiller's behalf.

2.1

Two weeks ago Chair Weisenmiller announced his retirement from public service which will take affect this Thursday. The Chair has appreciated his time as an ex officio member of this board since 2014. In that time, Energy Commission staff have worked extremely diligently and been remarkably effective in administering the programs established by Prop 39 and the following legislation and regulations that make up this great clean energy and jobs effort.

As you heard, we worked with our LEA partners to administer over \$1.7 billion for energy efficiency upgrades in some of the most important buildings in our state.

We've also been able to help advance the state's emissions reduction goals and support our statewide economy through our ECAA-Ed loans and the Bright Schools program. We are now in the second stage of our school bus replacement program which will help improve the air quality of our most vulnerable populations in advance critical clean bus technologies.

CEC staff and our partners in labor and education have been integral to the successes of these programs.

This progress has been enhanced by the great leadership and oversight of this board.

Chair Weisenmiller would like to recognize our former Chair Kate Gordon, who will certainly continue providing excellent public service in her new role at OPR. And to today's new chair and the other board members, thank you for your service providing your oversight and guidance to ensure these programs continue to achieve the goals established by the people in Prop 39.

Finally, Chair Weinsenmiller would like to recognize and thank Jim Bartridge, Jack Bastida, and Liz Shirakh and all of the rest of the Citizens Oversight Board and CEC staff who have been integral to the program's success.

CHAIR GOLD: Thank you. Incredible leadership obviously coming from Chair Weisenmiller. So thank you so much.

All right. So I think with that, we move to roll call.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Did any other board members have any opening comments or?

No? Okay.

23 CHAIR GOLD: I pretty much guessed that one.

1	MR. BARTRIDGE: All right. You got it right.
2	CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.
3	MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. So Vice Chair Gold.
4	CHAIR GOLD: Here.
5	MR. BARTRIDGE: Adrienne Alvord.
6	BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: Here.
7	MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias. Barbara Lloyd.
8	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Here.
9	MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez.
10	BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Here.
11	MR. BARTRIDGE: And joining remotely, Heather
12	Rosenberg.
13	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Here.
14	MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.
15	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry, had to get off
16	mute.
17	MR. BARTRIDGE: And with that, we do have a quorum.
18	CHAIR GOLD: All right. Thank you.
19	All right. Does anybody want to move approval of
20	the minutes from the December 3 meeting?
21	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I'll move with the
22	amendments
23	COURT REPORTER: Microphone, ma'am, please.

1	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Sorry. I'm happy to move with
2	the minor amendments I sent in to staff.
3	CHAIR GOLD: All right. Do you want to recount
4	those so we're all comfortable with them or?
5	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: There were typos, hold on.
6	CHAIR GOLD: Oh, if they were typos, then that's
7	fine. I was very conscious that I was tardy, I think that
8	was highlighted to everybody.
9	(Laughter)
10	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: There were really one word
11	missing and a spacing problem and one word that should have
12	been will instead of with. I mean, it was literally typos.
13	CHAIR GOLD: Okay.
14	MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.
15	CHAIR GOLD: All right. So is there a second?
16	BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: I'll second.
17	CHAIR GOLD: All right. All in favor?
18	(All board members said aye.)
19	CHAIR GOLD: I assume Heather said aye.
20	Heather, did you say aye?
21	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yep.
22	CHAIR GOLD: Okay.
23	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yep.

1	CHAIR GOLD: Great. So.
2	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye, aye.
3	CHAIR GOLD: All right. Thank you.
4	All right. So let's move on to the next item which
5	is discussion and vote on the Citizens Oversight Board
6	chair position.
7	And I would even though she'll probably hit
8	me I would like to nominate Adrienne Alvord to be the
9	chair the chair of the oversight board.
10	If you don't know Adrienne's background, she's the
11	Union of Concerned Scientists' western states director.
12	And she's working to ensure Californians to and all
13	Americans to transition to a clean energy and fuels economy
14	that reduces global warming, promotes equitable economic
15	growth, and improves public health in western states.
16	Adrienne has also championed Prop 32 working for
17	Fran Pavley and is still working to make sure that AB 32 is
18	doing everything it's supposed to do while she's at Union
19	of Concerned Scientists.
20	So I nominate Adrienne Alvord. Is there a second?
21	BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: I'll second.
22	CHAIR GOLD: All right. Do you need a roll call
23	vote or?

1	MR. BARTRIDGE: Let's do a roll call vote.
2	CHAIR GOLD: Okay.
3	MR. BARTRIDGE: Adrienne Alvord.
4	BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: Aye.
5	MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd.
6	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Aye.
7	MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg.
8	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye.
9	MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez.
10	BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Yes.
11	MR. BARTRIDGE: And Chair Gold.
12	CHAIR GOLD: Yes.
13	MR. BARTRIDGE: Very good. Congratulations.
14	CHAIR GOLD: Congratulations.
15	BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: Thank you.
16	CHAIR GOLD: Do you want to give us a long speech
17	to
18	BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: No, I don't. But I will say
19	that as I believe the newest member of this board; is that
20	correct?
21	MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez was actually
22	renominated in October.
23	BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: Okay. Well

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: So. But you're very close. 2 BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: One of the newest members. 3 MR. BARTRIDGE: There you go. 4 BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: I would just ask for your 5 forbearance, I'm still frankly coming up to speed. This is 6 a big program and it's done a lot of wonderful things and 7 so your help would be appreciated fellow board members and staff. Thank you, I really appreciate the honor and I'll 8 9 do my best to carry this forward in a way that will do it 10 proud. Thank you. Thank you. 11 MR. BARTRIDGE: 12 CHAIR GOLD: Thank you. Thanks for your 13 willingness to do so. 14 All right. So next up is discussion, possible vote on vice chair. And so I'd like to nominate Randall 15 16 Martinez for that position. 17 He's currently the executive vice present and COO 18 for Cordoba Corporation, a California-based company. 19 has over 30 years of industry experience, primarily 20 responsible for advancing the firm's commitment to provide 2.1 customized planning, engineering, management, and construction services to meet client needs in the areas of 22 23 transportation, water, energy, and education facilities.

1	And I'm nominating him despite the fact he's a
2	Trojan, which if you know me, that's pretty hard to
3	believe. So that's my nomination. Is there a second?
4	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I'll second.
5	CHAIR GOLD: All right. Roll call vote.
6	MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark Gold.
7	CHAIR GOLD: Yes.
8	MR. BARTRIDGE: Adrienne Alvord.
9	BOARD MEMBER ALVORD: Yes.
10	MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias. Barbara Lloyd.
11	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes.
12	MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall.
13	BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Right on. Yes.
14	CHAIR GOLD: Oh, man.
15	MR. BARTRIDGE: And Heather Rosenberg.
16	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes.
17	MR. BARTRIDGE: Very good. Congratulations.
18	CHAIR GOLD: I'm not even going to ask him to make
19	remarks. (laughter)
20	All right. Let's move
21	MR. BARTRIDGE: Chair, if I could
22	CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.
23	MR. BARTRIDGE: if I could just note that

Commissioner McCallister's advisor Martha Brook has joined 1 2 us. 3 CHAIR GOLD: Oh. Welcome. 4 All right. Did you have any -- I'm sorry, did you 5 have any remarks that you wanted to make or? 6 MS. BROOK: (Indiscernible.) 7 CHAIR GOLD: Okay. All right. All right. So now we're into the presentation 8 9 section. So let's start with the annual report from the CEC. 10 11 MR. BARTRIDGE: And presenting, we have David 12 Velazquez with staff. 13 MR. VELAZQUEZ: Thank you, Jim, for the introduction, and thank you for everyone for being here. 14 15 My name is Dave Velazquez, I work for the Local 16 Assistance and Financing Office and this was the office 17 that was tasked with overseeing these programs. 18 So without further ado, start the presentation. 19 This is the Proposition 39 K-12 Program and Energy Conservation Assistance Act 2017, 2018 progress report. 20 21 For the agenda, we're going to start off with the report 22 overview, then go into Proposition 39, Energy Conservation 23 Assistance Act, Educational Sub Account, also known ECAA-

Ed, the Bright Schools Program, then go to school bus replacement program, and we'll end with any questions.

For the report overview. As mentioned before, the report includes four program components, Prop 39, ECAA-Ed, Bright Schools, and school bus replacement program. The reporting period was December 19, 2013 through June 30, 2018.

Here we have the appropriations for the fiscal years for which the programs were active. As you can see, Prop 39 fluctuated a bit from year to year while ECAA-Ed had two identical years of 28 million. The total for Prop 39 came up to approximately 1.748 billion, while ECAA-Ed had 56 million for a total of approximately \$1.8 billion.

We're going to go into Proposition 39. Overview application process. Local education agencies completed and submitted energy expenditure plan applications using the online system. After that, staff reviewed the application by going over cost effectiveness and energy savings of the application. Once the review was complete, the EEP was approved. Once the EEP was approved,

California Energy Commission notified the California

Department of Education of approved applications on a weekly basis. From there, the California Department of

Education distributed funding to LEAs on a quarterly basis.

2.1

Funding allocation by LEA type. 2189 LEAs were eligible under the program as shown in the graph. Charter schools came in at 54 percent followed by public schools at 43 percent, County Office of Education at 58 with 3 percent, and state special schools had 3 with less than 1 percent.

LEA funding distribution. As mentioned before, approximately \$1.748 billion were available in funding so the graph here is breaking down that distribution. Public schools came in at 82 percent of the funding, followed by charter schools with 17 percent, County Office of Education at 1 percent, and state special schools at less than 1 percent.

Prop 39 success. Here we have allocated versus awarded. Please take note that allocated was the available funding for LEAs and awarded is the amount approved and spending. As mentioned before, \$1.748 billion was allocated and as of June 30, 2018, approximately \$1.7 billion was awarded meaning that over 95 percent of the money was approved.

Here we have approved and spent by reporting period. As you can see, there are year over year increases

but please note that there are -- these are cumulative 1 2 figures. So June 16 is encompassing of December 15 and so 3 on and so on. 4 We have our LEA participation by tier level. 5 the top is the definitions for what the tier is and on the 6 bottom, we have the participation level by those tiers. 7 Tier 4 had 99 percent of participation, followed by Tier 3 at 90, Tier 2 at 74, and Tier 1 at 72. Not shown here is 8 9 how these numbers are reflected in the overall program participation. Tier 1 is accounting for approximately 9.7 10 percent, Tier 2 at 55.1, Tier 3 at 8.7, and Tier 4 at 11 12 26.5 percent overall program participation. 13 Here we have the participation by high, free, and 14 reduced priced meals also known as FRPM. As you can see, 15 the participation rate of high FRPM --16 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Unmuted it. MR. VELAZQUEZ: No worries. Of high FRPM LEAs came 17 18 in at 76 percent, and the participation rate of nonhigh 19 FRPM LEAs came in at 83 percent. 20 Again, not shown is the overall program 21 participation which comes out to high FRPM LEAs making up 22 35 percent of the program while the nonhigh FRPM LEAs 23 making up the remaining 65 percent.

Here we have the cumulative Energy Expenditure Plan approvals. Number of EEPs was 2,139 while the number of school sites was 7,298. Note that LEAs can have multiple EEPs and that EEPs can have multiple sites.

Here we have some examples of eligible energy efficiency measures. We have lighting systems, heating and air conditioning, retrofits, controls, pumps and motors, plug loads, building insulation, as well as clean energy generation commonly known as solar panels.

Here we have a summary of implemented energy measure categories. As you can see, total percent of measures approved, the highest came in at lighting systems at 54 percent, followed by HVAC and lighting controls with 21, HVAC at 14, other energy efficiency measures at 8, and self-generation at 3 percent.

We're going to talk about a little bit
accomplishments of Prop 39 program. The cumulative summary
of final project completion reports, final project
completion reports are completed projects with 12 months of
post insulation energy uses data. With the 292 final
project completion reports that were received in this
reporting period accounted for 13.65 percent of total
projects. As you can see, total project costs, Prop 39

share and leverage funding increased since we last reported.

2.1

The table here tells the same story as the one before with every category increasing this past year while savings to investment ratio, the SIR, stayed the same. So the total cost annual savings did increase from 11.9 million.

Energy use intensity, also known as EUI, as noted by the table the total combined annual weighted average EUI for these projects before was 96.9 kBtu per square foot with a reduction of 14.5 kBtu per square foot to come to an after of 82.4 kBtu per square foot.

Now we're going to move on to ECAA-Ed and Bright Schools. ECAA-Ed was a zero percent interest revolving loan program. It funded similar energy efficiency measures as Prop 39. Currently there are 35 loan funded projects. Moving forward SB 110 also authorized an ECAA-Ed competitive process. The program opportunity notice is up on our website for anybody who is interested in this program and we look forward to reporting back to the COB on ECAA-Ed competitor at a future meeting.

Bright School's technical assistance. This program provides technical assistance up to \$20,000 to identify

energy saving measures at existing facilities. These include energy audits, third-party proposal reviewal, and professional engineering support services.

2.1

Some accomplishes of the Bright School's program, 190 technical assistance grants, 158 of those were energy audits, 22 EEP preparations, 10 product bid specifications, and identified measures estimated to save 28,626 megawatt hours as well as 305,025 therms of natural gas.

ECAA-Ed funding. Shown here is a breakdown of funds for ECAA-Ed and Bright Schools. Approximately 10 percent of ECAA-Ed funding went to the Bright School's program as well as this program still has available funding. So if anybody is interested, please visit the Bright School's program website.

Now we're going to move on to school bus replacement program. The funding of 75 million comes from SB 110. Applicants who are eligible for this program are school districts and County Offices of Education and Joint Power Authorities. Priority will be given to the oldest school buses. School buses operating in disadvantaged communities or to schools that have a majority of students eligible for free or reduced price meals in the prior year. Any school bus replaced must be scrapped as well.

The program has three funding components. First, 1 2 being the actual school bus replacement which actually 3 replaces the oldest, dirtiest diesel school buses with 4 battery electric school buses. The second, charging 5 infrastructure for said buses. And the third, workforce 6 training for the infrastructure and the actual school 7 buses. Here are some milestones for the school bus 8 replacement program. As you can see, Phase II was released 9 in December of 2018 and applications are due March 11, 10 11 2019. 12 Any questions? 13 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Does anybody have any questions 14 about the report? It was a lot of material. David, thank you for 15 16 giving it to us. I was just wondering, on the school bus 17 program, when are the buses supposed to be purchased by 18 for? Is there a date on that? 19 MR. VELAZQUEZ: I'm going to defer to the school 20 bus replacement program. 21 MS. JOHN: Hi, I'm Elizabeth John, office manager 22 with our school bus program. We have set a rolling 23 schedule for the delivery of the buses. Our anticipation

is that we hope to get the first 10 percent out by the end of this year. And then from there, increase the amount of buses released until I believe 2022.

But our hope is to get more buses out faster. But we understand that infrastructure needs to be built to charge the buses as well. So we're working on both of those.

BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Thank you so much. All right.

Any other questions on the report? No.

All right. Does -- well, first of all, I just want to say on the overview, again, having sat on a number of committees in my career where trying to spend out money within a certain time frame for projects of this scope and scale, admittedly most of that has been, you know, more large water projects. But just to see that this level of effort can occur over such a wide swath of schools throughout the entire state of California in such a short period of time is really, I think, maybe even a bigger story than the energy efficiency gangs to be quite candid.

So I really think everybody has a lot to be commended for in really making sure that the program works to that -- in that manner.

With that, does anybody want to move approval for

1	the report?
2	CHAIR ALVORD: So moved.
3	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Is there a second?
4	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I'll second.
5	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Great. Let's just do it this
6	way. All at once, all in favor?
7	(All board members said aye.)
8	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Any opposed?
9	Hearing none, passes back, admission. Thank you.
10	MR. BARTRIDGE: All right. So the next item is the
11	annual report from the California Community College
12	chancellor's office on I believe it said Carlos Montoya is
13	going to be presenting.
14	MR. NGUYEN: Good afternoon, members of the board.
15	My name is Hoang Nguyen, Carlos Montoya couldn't be here
16	today.
17	MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Thank you.
18	MR. NGUYEN: Thank you for having me. So today
19	we're going to go over the chancellor's office Proposition
20	39 Clean Energy Jobs Act for Year 5. The topics
21	UNKNOWN VOICE: Got it?
22	MR. NGUYEN: Got it. Topics covered today will be
23	the budget and the closed out projects. The energy and

sustainability awards that we just had recently, program summary, and we're going over our workforce economic development years 4 -- years 3 and 4 and their accomplishments.

2.1

so the breakdown for the funding that we received in fiscal 2017-18 was 12.8 percent went to workforce and economic development. The remaining funds was used for our program within the facilities planning unit. Of that money, the allocation 1.588 went to our consulting contract and the remaining went to the districts which was broken up by district through their full-time equivalent student percentage of the total.

In terms of the closed out projects, 38 districts closed out this past fiscal year. 139 projects were closed out from completion. And all the different forms that were required for this -- to close out an actual project which equated to about \$28 million in project costs. Of that, 11.6 kilowatt hours is in savings, about 1200 in kilowatt savings and 328,000 in therm savings. In total the -- it was almost roughly 2 million energy cost savings for the 38 districts.

In terms of direct job years, it was 155 job years that were created, 4 trainee job years, and 322,000 direct

job hours. And roughly about 9,000 apprenticeship direct job hours from that. The IOUs for '17, '18 paid out roughly \$1.2 million to the district to help out with the program, the construction and their projects.

2.1

This equates to about 2200 homes powered through the -- through the savings that were generated. Of the 139 projects, we broke it out through the various categories.

As you can see, lighting projects are still taking the charge. Initially the system, they did the outside lighting on campus, now they're working on the internals of the buildings just to save more energy. Next was HVAC and then controls. And following that was MBCx, RCx selfgeneration and other energy efficiency measures.

I want to bring up what I did last time was the Board of Governor's Energy and Sustainability awards. Last time I presented what happened from the past -- from 2012 to 2017. We just had our recent one in January so we'll go over that, the winners for this one.

Best overall for the large district, we had Coast for interior lighting. And for the medium sized district, we have Peralta, also interior lighting retrofit. And for the small district, we had Shasta-Tehama-Trinity joint, and they did a solar PV project.

In terms of retrofit project, we have Orange Coast College, they did a stadium lighting, gym, theater retrofit for their award. And MBCx Butte College project for their main campus.

For renewable energy, Butte College also won again for another solar voltaic project, they're leading the charge on that there. They have a lot of land and lots of sun.

We also had a faculty-student initiative award.

Basically what that entails is the district, campus, or colleges with the students, the faculty, they lead the charge on sustainability for their campuses. Mt. San Antonio, they did a climate action plan in which their staff, students all worked after hours on their own time trying to figure out a plan for their campus to move forward to be sustainable all across the board. So we awarded the sustain -- actually the faculty-student initiative to Dr. Bill Scroggins because he led the charge on that for their district.

And we also have for the sustainability champion, two winners this year. Last year, every year prior we had one. But the -- we couldn't separate the two because they were in pairs. What happened was one of them -- there are

actually two districts. One was working at Long Beach but he recently left and moved on to South Orange so it should have been just Long Beach CCD but he had moved on. Marlene Dunn, she led the charge for creating or assisting their district with a energy master plan for the district. Medhanie Ephrem was the main program manager of that of which they worked with our office in creating a template that the district system can use across the state so that way smaller districts, medium sized districts, what have you, can take a look at that template and be able to use that as their own reference point and without having to go out and contract with others because it's a costly venture to create your own energy master plan. They already did all of ground work for that so they allowed us to take their work, create a template out of it using it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Of Honorable Mentions, we had four districts and five projects within the previous categories. In some (indiscernible) Proposition 39 program, all the funding has been encumbered by the districts this past fiscal year. Right now we're working on trying to close out all the projects by June 2019 and expect to have the final report next year. With all the funding for the districts, we had a 6 percent reduction in energy uses across the system.

And what that really entails is we send out a workbook where the district self-completed, self-certify their energy usage across the different campuses.

With this, we use a 2012 baseline compared to what they currently sent in of which 36 districts were -- they reduced their energy usage. Seventeen districts increased but they also had the ability to grow in size of the campus as well so that would explain some of that increase in energy usage. And of that, only 19 did not report.

The ongoing challenges that we're facing with sustainability and Proposition 39 programs that are project delays for years 4 and 5 funding, the project complexity has gone up for years 4 and 5 so it's taken quite a bit longer to actually complete projects. As you know, community colleges and any college in general, or campuses, can only really construct during the summer months and winter break. If they miss that deadline, they aren't able to actually do anything during the months where they teach, otherwise they would disrupt the classrooms.

On top of that, there's also longer DSA review periods for these types of projects as we get into more complex projects as well instead of the usual promised one month, two months, they're kind of getting stressed out

over there.

We're also having district energy management expertise, there's lacking across the system. We have quite a few small and medium sized districts that don't have the funding to pay for faculties that can oversee these types of projects. So we kind of assist them with the IOUs and our own consultant to help backfill some of that. But even then, there are still some issues with that.

And of course districts' staff turnover, add districts as well. A lot of people are retiring and that knowledge on the campuses isn't being transferred over as they leave.

Moving on to workforce and economic development, these funds are distributed through five regional fiscal agents which they disperse through a grant system. The investments made were in energy, construction, utilities, faculty development, curriculum, alignment, and technical assistance. The money is broken out through the five regions. For this past two years, we have 6.1 million through the far north, Bay Area, Central Valley, LA, Orange County, inlands, and pretty much SoCal.

And we had the unique completers here as well.

Unique completers from what I was told, it's not really my
-- I don't really see this one -- but unique completers
they stated to me was an individual that was able to
complete more than one award or certificate. And they try
to eliminate duplicates. So of that, we had about 7,000
students that were able to complete more than one
award/certificate.

Broken out through the different programs here, we have architectural technology, 400,000; industrial systems technology and maintenance, 345; environmental control technology, 1.5; and as you can see, the remaining eight categories all together in terms of awards, we have 10,327 students that received a form of a certificate of some sort which will be broken down here through the different regions. So it's for 6 to 18 units, 1900 students graduated with that or received a certificate through that program. Eighteen units plus, 5,600 students. And the other category, twenty-seven almost twenty-eight hundred students got a certificate or an award through that.

And other category really means program or certificate that wasn't in the main pot of categories such as nursing or anything like that. They're a subset which isn't recognized so that's where their category says other.

And since we did accomplishments for the facility side, we do accomplishments for the web side as well. And the first category is course development and programs. They launched CareerQuest, an online career assessment to guide students into the energy field. That was done in Orange County. They developed a construction technology pathway program at LA Mission and LA Southwest. And they developed a HVAC dual enrollment pathway at Fresno City College. They also developed and launched two new HVAC certificates at Bakersfield College and West Hills Coalinga.

2.1

Continue on, they developed a building energy system professional program at College of the Desert. A new utility career training program for gas and electric. This was done with San Diego Gas and Electric. And an online dual enrollment OSHA 10 program at Cuesta College which is in San Luis Obispo.

And campus labs is another category. Sacramento
City College, they completed a mobile HVAC demonstration
room or trailer so that it can be used as a living lab.
College of Siskiyous created a mobile tiny house for
demonstration. And Oxnard College created a campus living
lab with 25 participating students.

And with that also the last category is partnership. Partner with the North State Building Industry Association and Los Rios to implement an innovative outreach recruitment pilot. Initiated a partnership between high schools, regional community colleges, and the Southwestern Regional Carpenters Union for education. Another partnership with the California Construction Industrial Materials to create a (indiscernible) pipeline. And that concludes my presentation. And also wanted to mention that the report was approved today by the deputy chancellor and our vice chancellor of publications. So what you have there has been approved by our office. BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Thank you so much, Hoang. Are there any questions from anybody? Please. BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Can you tell me a little bit about what the role of your consultant was in the program? MR. NGUYEN: Unlike the K-12, we don't have like the Energy Commission to assist us so we hire a consultant to do the database tracking, go out and do measurement verification. So they do all the things that the CEC would do for K-12. So they go out help smaller districts, POU

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

system -- or districts as well and help do the calculations 1 2 and everything of that nature. 3 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Thank you. 4 CHAIR ALVORD: I wonder, too, if you could just in 5 terms of the ongoing challenges --6 MR. NGUYEN: Yes. CHAIR ALVORD: Provide a little bit more detail 7 terms of what's -- are there new things that are causing 8 9 project delays or is it the same sort of issue with the 10 school year and in what ways is the complexity increasing? That was kind of intriguing. 11 12 MR. NGUYEN: So initially we were doing the -- in 13 year 1, 2 we were mainly doing lighting. That got off the 14 ground pretty fast and easy mainly because they're just LED 15 technology. Then moving on to HVAC, MBCx and then with 16 more funding and we started doing multiyear funding at that 17 point, started going to solar PV generation across multiple 18 districts as well at which point that complexity went up 19 for multiple districts. So in a sense, they're new but not 20 new in terms of issues that are -- that are arisen, but --2.1 CHAIR ALVORD: You got the easy stuff done first. 22 MR. NGUYEN: Right. Pretty much. 23 CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

1 MR. NGUYEN: I mean, that's just the way the 2 loading order worked. 3 CHAIR ALVORD: Sure. 4 MR. NGUYEN: So we weren't really -- we were aware 5 of it, but we didn't know that districts weren't capable of 6 handling like these types of projects at that point. 7 CHAIR ALVORD: Gotcha. Thank you. BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Any other questions? 8 Yeah, Randall. 9 10 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Thank you for the report and continued kudos to the chancellor's office for such 11 12 creative ways to advocate this program. I'm a fan of the 13 sustainability awards. 14 I have a question as it relates to the new online community college that I have heard about, read about. And 15 16 I'm curious to know what the plans will be to incorporate 17 Prop 39 into the online college whether it's through the 18 workforce economic development chapter or others. 19 curious to know what the plans are there. That remains to be seen. 20 MR. NGUYEN: That was a 21 different unit altogether, so I'll have to check and get 22 back to you on that how we're going to incorporate 23 sustainability as part of the online program.

1	VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Will it be fair to expect a
2	section in future annual reports?
3	MR. NGUYEN: Possibly. I'll have to check again.
4	Totally different unit so I'm not really a part of the
5	talks right now for that.
6	VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Okay. I'd like to
7	respectfully request that we have a report back on that
8	item.
9	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Sounds good.
10	Anyone else? Heather, did you have any comments or
11	questions?
12	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: No. It was helpful.
13	Thank you.
14	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. All right. Does anyone
15	want to move approval of the report?
16	VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: So moved.
17	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. And a second?
18	CHAIR ALVORD: Second.
19	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: I'll second.
20	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Heather second. All right.
21	Thank you. All in favor?
22	(All board members say aye)
23	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Any opposed? All right.

1	Passes unanimously.
2	MR. NGUYEN: Thank you.
3	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.
4	All right. So the next presentation is on the jobs
5	report from the California Workforce Development Board,
6	Sarah White.
7	MS. WHITE: How's that? Okay. I was just saying
8	that I was dropping off a ton of paperwork for you all to
9	enjoy in your spare time this weekend. But I'm going to
10	really walk through just what I what we're going to talk
11	about with the jobs and training.
12	Projects today.
13	MR. BARTRIDGE: Sarah, do you want to do it from up
14	here and?
15	MS. WHITE: I think this this is okay.
16	MR. BARTRIDGE: You're okay?
17	MS. WHITE: Yeah.
18	MR. BARTRIDGE: Just call out when you want me to
19	do the slides.
20	MS. WHITE: Okay. Oh, right. Okay. Trying to do
21	a few slides.
22	What's up first? Training.
23	Okay. So we have the California Workforce

Development Board -- first of all, let me say, good
afternoon, everyone. I'm Sarah White, Deputy Director for
Equity, Climate and Jobs at the California Workforce
Development Board. Delighted to be here as we have been
every year for quite a few years to update the oversight
board on the work that we've been doing.

And the Workforce Development Board is charged with two separate tasks under Prop 39. And so we have two other -- two reports and two little slideshows. One of those tasks is to -- to develop and pilot a pre-apprenticeship training program for -- to get underserved communities on to middle class jobs in construction careers related to the school retrofits.

The other is to actually explore and count the number of jobs that were created as a product of Prop 39 investments. So we'll do that second. That's the one that everyone really waits for so we'll do that last.

Let's see. So let me talk first a little bit about our Prop 39 training pilots, this is pre-apprenticeship for underserved communities. Again, designed to provide access to high-quality careers for all Californians. And we did this by working on the multicraft core curriculum. I'll say a little bit more about that but not going to go too

far into the weeds on our curriculum and partnerships. 1 But 2 this is a gateway, essentially, to registered apprenticeship in many trades related to energy efficiency 4 work.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that you're handing around and what I'll talk about today is an overview of the 12 training implementation grants. The report that's coming your way is stories of the individual projects and gives us specific data snapshot as of the end of this year -- the end of last year.

We have 12 projects and two cohorts. The report

So today, as always, we'll have our interim set of data numbers. We will have -- we are wrapping up the -for those who have not finished, there are a number of training programs which will finish in March and another couple that have been extended until June and we will have final numbers for you then. But these are the numbers that we present to legislature each year.

So the big story is that we have placed more than 1300 individuals into related jobs which is a huge number when you look at the populations that we're lifting up and kind of work this is. So we're very proud of that number. Another thing that I really want to highlight as an outcome of this is that this program is sort of five years now of

piloting these pre-apprenticeship partnerships. Because this is now a model for the state.

2.1

So we now have \$25 million from SB 1 funding to set up what we have proposed is a statewide pre-apprenticeship system in the construction trades where there is one hob in each of 14 regions so that we're not continuing -- the state is not continuing to fund sort of random pre-apprenticeships around the state but we'll have a single organized integrated system for construction pre-apprenticeship. This is based specifically on the lessons we've learned here. We're tremendously excited about that.

And we also were asked by the new governor to propose a way of doing that as part of his cap and trade work. So we'll now have another \$25 million to take the lessons learned from this and to build that into a statewide system of pre-apprenticeship. So this has been - this has borne incredible fruit. So the other piece I would say is we were also charged last year by the legislature as part of SB 1 with developing a set of guidelines for anybody who wants to do construction pre-apprenticeship. Obviously in those cases we're talking about roads and we're also talking about -- but there's a lot, you know, historic levels of investment in transit and

in acts of transportation.

2.1

And the jobs for retrofitting schools and the jobs for doing the SB 1 work are not entirely different jobs, they're the same set of crafts. Right? So we don't -- it's not a different kind of training program, that's why we use this as our model and as our springboard for going forward. So we feel that this is not only a project which has borne incredible fruit in the number of people that we have trained and placed and in the kinds of quality work that's been done on retrofitting schools but also on the work to come. So delighted with that.

And let me go -- oh, well, let's go back to the overview. That was my pre-overview, now here is the overview. I will really be quick here.

So we have spent since 2014, 13.3 million in clean energy job creation funds to build these earn and learn job training programs with -- we gave this out in three different kinds of grants, primarily training implementation grants for partnerships which I'll mention in a moment to actually train folks and prepare them for careers in the construction trades.

We gave out a few grants that were for development, folks who kind of didn't have their

partnerships together yet but thought they'd be good at doing it. We gave them a year to sort of with a little bit of money to figure out what their partnerships might look like and launch them with a full training implementation grant.

And then we have throughout provided funds to our technical assistance partners. And they are -- they have helped us in the field. All of our grant programs have technical assistance, primarily running communities of practice so that all of the partnerships come together with their different regions and the different populations that they might be serving to share best practices amongst themselves.

Since this was a pilot, a big piece of this was learning from one another and sharing those lessons learned. Our technical assistance folks ran that as well as being assistants in the field for each of the partnerships who came in with very different levels of skill around building partnerships. Some of them had never worked with trade unions before. Some of them had never worked with community colleges, some of them had never worked with Conservation Corps. So really our technical assistance was the glue that brought together all the

different kinds of partners that we had working in the field. So that's how the money went out.

2.1

The goals -- you can go to the next slide -- are pretty straightforward. We wanted to deliver clean energy skills to disadvantaged job seekers. This was an equity agenda that was part of Prop 39. We wanted to create structured pathways into apprenticeship. You know, the whole country has had its hair on fire about apprenticeship for the past five years but few people really understand how it works. Right?

So apprenticeship can be an amazing thing but in the trades alone, in the construction trades, there are dozens of different crafts and dozens of different ways to get into those apprenticeships. And so if you're coming from the outside and for somebody for whom let's say school didn't work the first time around, knowing how to get into apprenticeship is an insurmountable task. So one of the things that this did was to build pathways directly into apprenticeships for people who have been excluded from those opportunities in the past.

Of course, we want to generally through these apprenticeships to build the energy efficiency workforce and throughout this to align systems and leverage funding.

That is a bureaucratic sentence if I ever saw one. But what we mean by that is that, you know, there's a lot of money going into jobs and training. Right? There's a lot of money going into retrofitting, there's a lot of money in energy efficiency. And we want to make sure that wherever we're doing that, we're leveraging money in those systems and not setting up lots of new little programs that will then go away when the money's gone. So really paid attention throughout to where we could fit this into existing systems and lift up those systems. So that's what that means.

2.1

And I think just one other quick sentence about the structured pathways to apprenticeship. I think most folks might not realize but in the construction trades, to get into an apprenticeship is a really high bar for math, for reading, for tool handling knowledge, all of that sort of thing. So pre-apprenticeship really is sort of adult basic skills which is about getting your math and reading up to a level where you can actually compete to get into an apprenticeship as well as other services and assistance which we'll talk about in a moment.

But this is the best way that we know to take folks without a college degree and get them to make six

figures in five to six years in a lifetime career with benefits. So this is why we're really excited about this particular pathway in addition to the work that we need to retrofit the state.

2.1

Do you want to go ahead just flash up here quickly the current grantees. Our first cohort of six were partnerships organized around the state. You'll see the first one in Fresno. That's seven inland counties. So the entire Central Valley in many cases is covered by that as well as obviously in the Bay Area, in LA we've had a lot of emphasis.

If you go to the next slide. Later set of grantees then went farther south to San Diego and up to the northern counties as well. So -- and the central coast.

So we've got pretty good geographic distribution.

Let's move ahead to the next slide and say a little bit about what these projects do. So each of the pre-apprenticeship training projects are aligned with their local building trades councils and based on a nationally approved multicraft core curriculum. What this is is that a number of years ago, folks got together and said okay, there's, you know, 25 trades, each one has a different entrance exam. Each one has a different entrance place.

Each one has different requirements. Each one has different structure. And nobody faced in the beginning knows how to even navigate that. So what the multicraft core curriculum did is it got together all the trades and said surely there are some common prerequisites. And they decided together nationally that to get into any of the trades, this was a common set of prerequisites you needed.

So when we trained by this multicraft core curriculum, you have the prerequisites, then, that a person coming out of that program can enter any of the trades depending on what's open and what they want to do.

So this is tremendously exciting. It's also part of these partnerships that we're building which, as you can see, they include workforce development boards, building trades councils, joint apprenticeship training committees, various community colleges, the Conservation Corps, and other community organizations. So lots of different strands coming together in these partnerships, around this particular curriculum. So these partnerships are not only getting folks connected to jobs in the trades and jobs in energy efficiency careers of the sorts that will be retrofitting public schools, but also the kinds of services that are required.

So if you take a disadvantaged population, these are folks with all kinds of barriers to employment. To just get through this kind of pre-apprenticeship boot camp, if you will, they may need -- you need one partner who's going to do the recruitment in a disadvantaged community that speaks the language of that community. You're going to need somebody to do services. Folks need to be hooked up with transportation, childcare, drug treatment and counseling, housing resources, any number of social services, so you need partners who can do that.

And then you need partners who are really attached to the trades and the labor markets so they know how to place folks into jobs. So those partnerships do all of that together. And no one partner can do any of that. So it's a pretty big undertaking solving any number of social as well as economic and labor market challenges.

You want to go to the next slide. The performance goals that we measure on this are pretty standard for workforce development. We want to look at the attainment of an industry valued credentials. So somebody completing this program, one of our Prop 39 programs, comes out with this certificate of the multicraft core curriculum. That means they can go to any building trade

in the state and say I took this, you know what it means.

You know what it's worth. And there's still work right now
to negotiate what the entrance value of that certificate
is, but it is a credential that is known around the state.

And around the country, in fact. So we've gotten that.

Several kinds of outcomes we thought were valuable. Obviously we're trying primarily to get folks into building trades apprenticeships and that's certified or registered apprenticeships not just programs that are called apprenticeships. There's a lot of sort of low -- low road actors out there who call it apprenticeship so you can just pay people a lower wage scale. But real state certified apprenticeships are based on agreement between the trades and employers and the apprentice and there are standard benchmarks for skill acquisition, and then increased pay until you get your journey card at the end of anywhere from four to six years.

So getting into a state certified apprenticeship is really the gold standard. But we also think that if somebody wanted to continue at a community college and get a degree, that's a great outcome. We're not going to say no, that's not a good outcome, you didn't go into an apprenticeship. We think that's pretty good. We also

think that getting a job related to energy efficiency even if it's not in an existing apprenticeship right now, that's a good outcome too. So employments of all sorts is a good outcome.

So those are the things we track. And as I said, we have close to 1400 individuals placed through the end of 2018.

If you want to go to the next slide. These are performance snapshots. I don't want to spend a lot of time on these. We do have more details on these for those who are curious. I think what this shows is that if you go this and then the next one, these are for our two cohorts. That is hard to read on the orange. I'll talk to our design folks about that. But, you know, looking at these, overall we have 80 percent -- let me see. Sorry. 81 percent and 64 percent placement rates.

These are tremendously high in workforce development. Because if you think of the kinds of issues that folks are managing as they go through this to get folks through a training program successfully and into a job, it's a big lift. It costs a lot of money and these numbers are we think pretty dang good.

The ones -- they also because these are pilots,

we use these numbers for continuous improvement. And for some of the folks that have low placement numbers, that was an opportunity for us to go back and say, you know, why the low placement numbers? And we found in a number of cases, thinking in this case some of our technical college partners and some of our Conservation Corps partners who do fabulous work but they're having really low placement numbers or low compared to others.

And one of the challenges here is that these are incredibly popular programs that have been very successful. And if you're running a cohort of folks, if you get out in front of the demand, you're not going to be able to place people. So if there's not enough jobs, you don't get to be an apprentice unless there's a job, that's the beauty of apprenticeship. It's not just a program, it's a job.

So you can train all the preapprentices you want but if there aren't actual jobs for them to go into, they will not make it into apprenticeship. So one of the things that we've really been working with our partners and are trying to build into our future partnerships is this idea that you can't get in front of the demand. Even though you may have the capacity, you may have the space, and you may have the faculty, and you may have the services lined up,

you can't keep running people through your training program because you want to run a training program every quarter.

If you don't have the jobs, this is what happens. You run through and then there's no job at the end so you get bad placement numbers. That's what that looks like.

2.1

We're just trying to encourage people to and it's very hard because you have to read your labor market and it's challenging to know when the placements are going to be available. So. So there's a lot of work that goes into this and happy to talk more about that at any given time.

Let's jump ahead one more to the lessons. And these lessons that we use to build our guidelines for preapprenticeship to every climate and energy agency in the state who wants to build jobs and training programs and use pre-apprenticeships. We now have released a set of guidelines on what you need to do to do that successfully. And three of the lessons that that's based on are an active involvement with the local building trades because that's how you find out where the jobs are, where the apprenticeships are, and how you get into them.

So. It also means that at each partnership, for example, if you have a cohort of let's say 20 individuals, they get to go visit each of the trades, they get to learn

is this a job that I want to do for the rest of my life?
Would I be good at it? Am I interested in it? It's really
opening a gateway to apprenticeship which might not be
successful if you haven't had a chance to suss that all out
ahead of time.

2.1

So we think it's tremendously important to be connected to the trade so that folks have a chance ahead of time to learn about the careers. And also so that they know when -- I mean, every trade has a different schedule for entrance exams so you could come out of a program and you wanted to be an electrician but their intake exam isn't for another six months. So what do you do in the meantime? So there's having a tight connection to the trade so might be able to place you in a helper occupation until the exam opens up. Super important.

And this is related to the second lesson where it's just describing it. Placement is not guaranteed and it's not instantaneous. So these partnerships have to do a lot of work to figure out how they're going to keep people engaged and involved until an apprenticeship does open up. And I think this is a lesson for all of us and for the state certainly who keeps thinking like let's just throw money into pre-apprenticeship, right, because it's great.

Well, all we're going to get is a lot, a lot, a lot of successful pre-apprentices. If we don't tie it to the labor market, we're not going to get successful apprenticeship outcome. So.

2.1

And I think that the last lesson and perhaps the most important one is that this is not just a curriculum. We talk a lot about our multicraft curriculum. But it's really much more than a curriculum, it's not just a classroom where people learn things. It is a whole suite of supportive services which are key for everything from recruitment to success to completion. And, you know, whether it's not enough to get remedial algebra, right, you also need help with, as I said housing or ticket amnesty, or any of the other things that you might need to get into a career in the trades.

So I'll leave it at that. I think that's my last slide on the -- yeah -- on the -- on the Prop 39 pre-apprenticeship training programs which we are now morphing into a larger program at the state called High Road Construction Careers.

So happy to take questions on that if there are any.

BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. Well thank you

for your enthusiastic overview and how the program's going. 1 2 It's good to see that you're -- all this great work that 3 you guys have done. 4 Did anyone want to make any? Yes. 5 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. So one of the things that I didn't see is a little bit more information about 6 7 the populations served and, you know, particularly, say, women who are --8 9 MS. WHITE: Uh-huh. 10 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- more underrepresented --11 MS. WHITE: Right. BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- in these kinds of 12 13 industries and, you know, and possibly other --14 MS. WHITE: Right. 15 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- you know, sort of 16 demographic groupings. Does that information exist 17 somewhere else in your bigger program report? 18 MS. WHITE: Yeah, we do -- we have imperfect 19 demographic information. We've gone between -- we are in 20 between data systems which connect that, so we have some. 21 What we were primarily looking at when the program was 22 first launched there were three target populations. -- now let's see if I can do this. It was veterans, women, 23

and low-income, I believe. Just see if I have this here still.

2.1

We have throughout our programs broaden that to - we found that, for example, even in the first year that
Helmets to Hardhats did a great job. Our programs weren't
really serving veterans and didn't need to serve veterans,
veterans weren't that interested and they had their own
program and that worked great. So it was sort of like
okay, we don't need to. But we have focused where -- I
mean, women in apprenticeship, incredibly huge issue. The
gender questions are enormous and we are looking at
investing other monies into solving exactly that problem.

One of the challenges is is that preapprenticeship is a great way to expand and diversify the
trades. One of the challenges is that you can prepare as
many women as you want but if the actual culture on the
jobsite doesn't change, then you're not going to have
persistence in the job. So one thing that we're looking in
is how do you actually change what an apprenticeship looks
like? Because if there's not good mentorship there, you
could have -- we run -- our partners have run a number of
all women cohorts which have been tremendously success and
they have their own sort of internal TA and support and

that's been amazing, we've learned a lot of lessons.

A lot of our partners work with Trades Women,
Inc., or other folks who are working with this population
specifically. The question is how can we get that kind of
mentorship and value carried into the apprenticeship
program so that when they come out -- so we've been very
successful in getting these folks through preapprenticeship, but then what happens when they get into
apprenticeship.

We've also had a large focus on ex-offenders.

And a lot of work being done with this. In fact, one of our grantees Flintridge works almost exclusively with ex-offenders, they're all themselves ex-offenders. They're just as involved. And so there's a very -- we ran a separate community impact just for that.

And so -- and the programs are designed overall to look at -- define disadvantaged very broadly. Right? So we have low income, we have a variety of minority populations, women, ex-offenders, and there are a few -- there's homeless. So we have a number of people working with homeless populations which is really astonishing and exciting.

So we can poll that information. I have some

```
general demographic data I can get you but we also have
1
 2
    stories from each of our partnerships themselves about what
 3
    their -- their lessons have been there. So we feel great
 4
    about that.
 5
              BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Thank you.
 6
              MS. WHITE: Yeah.
 7
              MR. BARTRIDGE: All right.
 8
              CHAIR ALVORD: Quickly. I just wanted a little
9
    clarification, I really appreciated your --
              MS. WHITE: Sure.
10
11
              CHAIR ALVORD: -- the richness of your commentary
12
    which answered a lot of questions.
13
              I think -- when you were talking about the
    performance snapshots and you were talking about placement
14
15
16
              MS. WHITE: Uh-huh.
17
              CHAIR ALVORD: -- you were talking, I assume
18
    about state certified apprenticeship --
19
              MS. WHITE: Uh-huh.
20
              CHAIR ALVORD: -- and not the other two types of
21
    placement that were in your performance goals; is that
    correct?
22
23
              MS. WHITE: No, the -- the data that we have is
```

1	
1	for all of those outcomes.
2	CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.
3	MS. WHITE: Right?
4	CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.
5	MS. WHITE: It includes and we have that
6	broken down elsewhere in detailed spreadsheets that I can
7	get to, but yeah, the performance snapshots are about
8	enrolled is how many folks, obviously, we got in the door,
9	how many you recruited. Trained is the percentage of those
10	that actually made it through the training.
11	CHAIR ALVORD: Uh-huh.
12	MS. WHITE: And it's it's an interesting
13	process because in some ways, we don't expect to see 100
14	percent because some people are going to find out it's not
15	for them. Right? And then the placement is the percentage
16	of those who were placed. And they could be placed in
17	continuing education, in apprenticeship, or in a related
18	job.
19	CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And so you said that
20	there's some data about which or how many in each of these
21	categories. Is this in the reports that we just got?
22	MS. WHITE: Yes.
23	CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

MS. WHITE: And there's about -- of those right 1 2 now, I think we're looking -- I think it's 637 of those are 3 actual apprentices. CHAIR ALVORD: All right. 4 5 MS. WHITE: So. 6 CHAIR ALVORD: Great. Thank you. 7 MS. WHITE: So a tremendous number of apprentices 8 but not, you know, not nudging above 60 percent, I would 9 say. 10 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. It's helpful. Thank you. 11 MS. WHITE: Sure. 12 MR. BARTRIDGE: Ran --13 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Thank you for the report. 14 It was nice to see you again. 15 MS. WHITE: Yeah, hi. I know you hear this every 16 year. I'm sorry. 17 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: A line of questions, 18 similar line here. So the program costs are about \$13 19 million? 20 MS. WHITE: Yes. 21 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Okay. And we successfully 22 graduated 1300 folks ready for some type of continued 23 training?

1 MS. WHITE: Yes. 2 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: So quick math is roughly 3 about \$10,000 --4 MS. WHITE: Yep. 5 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: -- for a success? 6 MS. WHITE: Yep. 7 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I'm just curious if there's some way to get an economic benefit multiplier on those 8 9 successful folks that are ready for placement so that we 10 could say \$10,000 and cost results in an economic benefit 11 for the state of "X" because these are folks that are 12 otherwise unemployed or underemployed --13 MS. WHITE: Yeah. 14 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: -- that are now gainfully 15 employed. 16 MS. WHITE: That's an interesting question. don't -- I don't have access to that. I haven't done -- we 17 18 haven't done those kinds of calculations, I don't know that 19 they're usually done that way. We know that a job is like 20 the best service you can provide. And we knew -- there is 2.1 a -- there is a number of academic studies that show, for example, there's a number of different ways to do it, 22 23 right, but if you look at like the path that you're

describing which is really the -- it's usually looked at 1 2 the hidden costs of unemployment. Right? Where you look 3 at what are the -- or actually I should say the hidden 4 costs of low-wage employment which is if you add up all of 5 the state social services that are invested to keep people 6 afloat, that -- that the money saved by getting them into 7 these jobs. 8 So you can do some of that backwards math. 9 don't have that but there is -- there have been a number of 10 studies that show what -- the reverse. Putting someone in a low-wage job costs in terms of state benefits and you 11 12 could just flip those numbers. 13 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: As we think about our report to the legislature and recommendations, having 14 15 information like that would be very helpful to support any 16 type of future recommendations for this program. 17 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Is that -- is that --18 yeah, is that sort of analysis something that you can add 19 to or just sustain? MS. WHITE: No, I don't think we'll be doing it. 20 21 We don't have the capacity to do that kind of thing. 22 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. 23 MS. WHITE: You would want to hire sort of UCLA

1	or Berkeley Labor Centers to run those kinds of numbers.
2	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay.
3	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I have a related question.
4	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Yeah.
5	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Maybe this is for Jim. We
6	have something that was added to our packet
7	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Yeah. Right.
8	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: about economic impact.
9	But that was the program overall?
10	MS. WHITE: No, I'm going to do that next.
11	That's about the job impacts, it's not about the training
12	impacts. I'll explain the difference.
13	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.
14	MS. WHITE: It's confusing. I think that for
15	this, I mean, generally what we're looking at here at
16	outcome numbers are not the economic value of a fully
17	employed Californian. What we're looking at is how many
18	folks do we train and get into these great jobs. Right?
19	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Uh-huh.
20	MS. WHITE: And that's where it goes that the
21	additional I mean, I think so and that's
22	traditionally what workforce looks at. Right? Like how
23	many people are employed and the numbers employed and the

quality of jobs. But the actual material value of 1 2 employment, I just don't know -- I don't know anyone who 3 does that. 4 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. So one thing that, you 5 know, you probably mentioned in previous presentations, but 6 I'm just wondering, obviously you're amazingly enthusiastic 7 about the outcome. And I'm just wondering when you first started out working on this, did you -- did you have any 8 9 metrics that you were hoping to achieve within this time 10 period and how did they sort of compare when you start to 11 look at -- obviously you tried a whole bunch of different 12 things --MS. WHITE: 13 Uh-huh. 14 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: -- and, you know, had pretty 15 good success in a lot of them. And I know a lot of colleges that, you know, really have a lot of challenging -16 17 18 MS. WHITE: Absolutely. 19 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: -- I mean, I know Trade Tech 20 pretty well. 21 MS. WHITE: Yeah. 22 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: And so I'm just wondering 23 from your perspective, obviously this has been something

that's a labor of love for you, how do you -- how do you 1 2 think it's sort of come out versus where --3 MS. WHITE: Right. 4 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: -- you thought it would be 5 when you started? 6 MS. WHITE: You know, I don't know, that's a good 7 question. I -- I always -- I -- well, let me say, I think 8 it's come out well. One of the ways we look at this is 9 comparing to other workforce numbers that aren't doing this 10 and these placement and graduation rates are extraordinarily high for that. I mean, usually if you're 11 12 looking anything about 60 percent, it's considered a home 13 run. 14 I know that it is -- we're doing two incredibly 15 hard things. We are serving populations with multiple barriers to employment. Really hard to do and really 16 17 expensive. Our numbers on serving ex-offenders, usually 18 you're looking at about 17,000 per. Right? Also, you know, so that's one thing, serving target populations, 19 20 difficult to do. Getting people into apprenticeships also 21 very hard to do. Very high bar, a very closely -- closely held system of quality jobs, right, which maintains their 22 23 quality by maintaining the skill standards of who gets in.

```
So they're trying to do two very hard things. And that's
1
 2
    why we say to people this is not for the faint of heart.
    Right? It's one thing to serve target populations, it's
 3
 4
    another thing to get them into apprenticeships. Doing that
 5
    together, super hard. So I think the numbers are terrific.
 6
              There have been -- traditionally -- I'm trying to
 7
    think of some studies that in the 2010s to 2012s before
 8
    this program started, there were -- there's really abysmal
9
    numbers on preapprenticeship. Because preapprenticeship
10
    was basically anything that sort of threw people towards
    the construction career. And the -- we don't have much
11
12
    data on the wage outcomes but the actual completion
13
    outcomes of those were pretty -- pretty miserable. So
14
    these are actually I think are tremendous outcomes. But I
15
    didn't -- when I started this -- or I didn't start this, I
16
    joined this three years ago so I wasn't there when this was
17
    designed. But compared to other programs around the
18
    country, I think it's a national model. And people are
19
    looking at these numbers and call us every day to say like,
20
    how are you doing that?
2.1
              BOARD MEMBER GOLD: That's good to hear.
22
    you.
23
              MS. WHITE:
                          Sorry, it's sort of a roundabout.
```

BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Any other questions? 1 2 got a question for -- I guess you have another part to your 3 presentation, right? 4 MS. WHITE: Yeah. 5 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. 6 MS. WHITE: A mini part, very fast. 7 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. Why don't we do that first? 8 Should we do that? Then this might 9 MS. WHITE: answer -- this is the data question, hopefully. 10 11 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. MS. WHITE: And this is often confusing for 12 13 people because one thing we can do and what you're asking 14 about is we train people, right, and we get them jobs, and 15 then you track people into the labor market. And we're 16 hoping that we have enough from our -- our last three 17 years, not our first two years, to do some longitudinal 18 data studies. So we should know in a year if people are 19 actually increasing their income from when they went out. 20 That's great but we need some time to pull that together 2.1 and match the base wage files. And we also have some 22 complex data that when this program was started, not all 23 partners were using that data system so we have to start

fresh maybe three years ago. So we'll have that data in a year which should be good.

2.1

But tracking someone into the labor market is a slightly different question than tracking what kind of jobs are created and who gets those jobs. Right? So one is sort of following people through and the other is following jobs and who comes into them. And those data sets almost never line up, they line up with some very expensive private software but almost nowhere else.

But so we were charged with -- the question was with Prop 39 because as you know it was closing a loophole. So unlike other kinds of investments that we might make where we might take, you know, "X" number of dollars and invest them in this, this will create jobs but it might not create net jobs because they took the money from some other investment they were going to make in California. But the Prop 39 dollars were brand new. We closed a tax loophole. So it was money that California had never seen before. So every job created is literally a brand new job for California. And that means a lot to economists and it should mean a little bit to us.

So what we were asked is, the program was sold early on to the legislature, I think, as a job creation

program. Right? Not only is it going to be great because we should retrofit all these schools but we're going to create all these great jobs in the meantime. Right? So they came to us and said all right, now you need to track. We don't really have any money for you but you need to track how many jobs have been created in addition to launching this crazy training program that nobody's ever been successful at before. So we said okay, we can do that. And I've been here talking over the years about the ups and downs of trying to get that data together.

2.1

But so what I'm reporting on now is the final jobs data information that we have. We procured this data from -- it started out as a partnership between CEC and the LEAs and Department of Industrial Relations and the Workforce Board and you see Berkeley and others. And then eventually it moved into largely a conversation between the board and UC Berkeley with the data to just get the numbers out.

So what I'm happy to report today is this is what people want to know, like did it create jobs or not? And the fact is it did create a lot of jobs and it create at least as many if not more than jobs that were done on the back of the envelope with the legislation was young.

So we've seen -- the answer is yes, lots of jobs, close to 20,000 jobs. Yeah, thanks. We -- I will come back to that. But, okay, so close to 27 jobs -- sorry, could you go back a slide? I'm getting ahead of myself.

So close to 20,000 jobs have been created from the Clean Energy Jobs Act. This is an update -- what we've handed out is an update to last year's report, estimating job creation based on K-12 clean energy projects that have been approved. These are the approved energy expenditure plans for K-12 sites, so be clear what we're talking about here. These were -- so -- and the data now goes through the end of those plans which is through June 30 of last summer. Right?

So we were doing it on a calendar year up until then but now when the original (indiscernible) Prop 39 completed so our data only goes through that completion. So the end of

That was projects at over 2,000 LEAs and again we track the numbers based on -- this is all in detail in the report. We tracked the number based on the disbursement of funds not the completion of projects because that's an entirely different data set.

last June, the end of the fiscal year.

So we can go to the employment impact. This is

the big overall, if you go to the next slide. This is the 19,812 jobs created. I have to say that in the first year when we rolled out these numbers there were great sighs of relief because everybody -- because I spent the first two years up here saying like you can't say how jobs are created and then we actually got some numbers. So this is good.

We know that we created 8,700 direct jobs, that means direct jobs on the retrofits. This is about 5.9 jobs per million dollars of investment which is a reasonable ratio. The spending on Prop 39 also has a multiplier in effect which is what you'll see up here. So this results an additional 3,800 indirect jobs in California industries. These are industries that provide supplies and materials, fuels, and other inputs into these projects. So we're driving that economic activity in there. So there's another 3,000 indirect jobs.

And then induced jobs. This is a bigger number, this is the 7,200 induced jobs. Induced jobs are generated by the spending of wages in a community. Right? So when you create these jobs, people have more money in their pocket and they go out and spend them. And the business income from those investments is a job driver. So you get

1 the total of 20,000

jobs created. Seeing over 8,000 direct jobs is a -- is a good number and seeing them all together with the induced jobs is a great number.

So and again to say that this is a critical and authentic contribution of Prop 39 rather than just money that would have created these jobs elsewhere. So this is 20,000 new jobs for California. If you go to the economic impact, another way of saying this, this shows the jobs also but we know that when you do the economic math on this, it's for the direct investment of close to 1.5 billion, you get about 700 million indirect economic activity. You get about 1.1 billion induced economic activity for a total of over 3 billion economic activity in California. So you're getting a -- it's about a 2.3 multiplier. And that's -- those again are great numbers.

If you want to go to the last slide. So what we know is that we invested Prop -- so you invested a million, I mean, a billion and a half of Prop 39 dollars that created a whole bunch of jobs, that's super important and it did what the legislation said it was going to do, so that's great.

The thing that we are most concerned about,

though, is not the number of jobs but really the quality of jobs. Because if we're creating a bunch of dead-end, lowwage jobs, that's not really an outcome. If we're creating the kinds of jobs where the state has to pay, you know, benefits and services, then that's not a good outcome. So one thing we looked at in the beginning and one thing we would like to do going forward was to really try and match the actual jobs created rather than doing economic model. So looking -- we know that early on we were able to match, we saw the prevalence of construction and skilled trades in all of this work pushes you towards the quality jobs. Those are genuinely high-quality jobs. They're pay a prevailed wage, they have health and retirement benefits. The apprenticeship utilization rate was about 18 percent on the early jobs that we measured and that's good, that's about four apprentices to journey worker, four or five per journey worker, which is great. apprenticeship again is a proxy for job quality because it means that you're going to have more learning and more access to higher wages. We don't have any reason to believe that these job quality indicators have fallen off but we have not been able to measure them in the past two years. For this we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

needed -- we need what we might have done at the start and what we hope to do at the start of any future investments which would be really looking at certified payroll records through there's a variety, again as I mentioned, private software companies that measure exactly this kind of stuff. And you find out exactly how many folks were employed at what rates and what their benefits were.

We do not have the capacity in California to do that outside of we did high -- we spent a lot of money on trying to do this in the first two years and we got some data which we were able to clean up to get the basic job quality indicators, but going forward we don't have access to that money. So we need a lot more staff, we need a lot more technology, and a lot more money to really get this set. So I would say in the future the really lesson learned is like don't put a dollar out the door until you have a job's tracker on it. Right? Like, that's how it needs to be done, you can't do it afterwards.

So that's -- that's my little bit of a downer lesson afterwards. But the 20,000 jobs is a good number and you can sell that. So I think the legislature is going to be very, very happy with that. And I am too. So.

BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. Well, thank you.

1	MS. WHITE: Any questions on that?
2	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Are they any questions.
3	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I guess I have one and I
4	want to make sure
5	MS. WHITE: Sure.
6	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: that I'm looking at this
7	correctly.
8	So in the K-12 program, we spent 1.7 some-odd
9	billion dollars on on this program and we got that
10	19,000 jobs.
11	MS. WHITE: Uh-huh.
12	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And I think that let me
13	just double check this again.
14	MS. WHITE: I should say that 1.5 billion, that's
15	because we had to deflate it to 2016 dollars so that we're
16	doing the same numbers every year.
17	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh, yeah. Okay.
18	MS. WHITE: That's why I said 1.5 billion. We
19	had to take this year's numbers and deflate them so that
20	every year we're not counting inflation in there, we're
21	actually looking at the same measures.
22	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. So that's that's
23	like

1	MS. WHITE: So sorry. That's yeah.
2	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: No, no, it's okay. So
3	that'll have some marginal well, I'm just trying to
4	think, is is that equivalent to saying that we're
5	spending on average about \$88,000 per job that we've been
6	able to generate direct, indirect, induced? Something
7	along those lines?
8	MS. WHITE: You could say that. We don't usually
9	like to say it that way, I don't think economists think
10	about it that way, that's like buying jobs.
11	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Because it's not really
12	expense
13	MS. WHITE: Yeah. It's not
14	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: on the job.
15	MS. WHITE: it's a different thing. You look
16	that on the training side because you say this much in
17	training dollars turned out somebody, you know.
18	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah.
19	MS. WHITE: That's a but sort of looking at
20	I mean, because what you're getting for that investment is
21	a retrofitted school. Right?
22	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.
23	MS. WHITE: Earmarked money.

1	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.
2	MS. WHITE: And the jobs are the gravy
3	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah, it's the gravy
4	MS. WHITE: on the side.
5	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: it's not the
6	MS. WHITE: Yeah.
7	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: primary (indiscernible).
8	
9	MS. WHITE: So some people it's the temptation to do the
10	math like that but it's it'll it
11	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It blurs the purpose.
12	MS. WHITE: it doesn't really reflect the
13	economy and it's also not a great number, obviously.
14	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay.
15	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: All right. Thank you.
16	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. So I had a
17	question for you, Jim, which is since some of this
18	information's sort of new to us, you know, as we walked in,
19	does it make sense to defer approving the report? Or
20	should we do it in light of the thorough presentation? I'm
21	seeing mixed head nod.
22	Okay. I could I mean, I think
23	MR. BARTRIDGE: I think that

1	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: I can ask the committee
2	members.
3	Does anyone want to move approval of the report?
4	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: Can I just say a comment
5	before you go move to do that?
6	It's just that in past years I know that there
7	have been discussion of this and because we spent the first
8	two years going in great detail and the methodology and all
9	of that that the the members of the board had been
10	willing to sort of look at the numbers and say like that's
11	okay because we have all the methodology, the same
12	methodology in the report that we've done each year. So I
13	don't know if you feel comfortable doing that but that was
14	a decision that was made last year.
15	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Is there any when's
16	our next meeting?
17	MR. BARTRIDGE: March 21. So we're going to take
18	the information that we receive today and start building
19	the COB report
20	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Right.
21	MS. WHITE: Right.
22	MR. BARTRIDGE: over the next two two
23	weeks. And we'll be then posting that and going over that

report for the March 21 meeting. 1 2 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. 3 MR. BARTRIDGE: So I mean, you could certainly --4 you could accept the information today, I think you've seen 5 all the information ahead of time, I've tried to get it out 6 to you although this, you know --7 MS. WHITE: Apologies for this. MR. BARTRIDGE: If you wanted to take more time 8 9 to review it, we could also adopt it at the next meeting or 10 approve it at the next meeting and, you know, make some note with the report that the report is based on this 11 information as well. 12 13 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Yeah. I mean, I think the only reason I'm bringing it up is just obviously, you know, 14 15 some of the information we -- we received today. 16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Right. 17 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: And so I generally try not to 18 get in the habit of approving stuff that I get today. 19 MR. BARTRIDGE: Right. 20 BOARD MEMBER GOLD: But that being said, I'd love 21 to hear from my fellow committee members, do you have any 22 thought? I mean, we could vote to accept the report so at 23 least it shows we've done something. Does that make sense

1	to you?
2	All right. Does anybody want to move that we
3	accept the report?
4	VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: So moved.
5	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. Is there a
б	second?
7	BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Second.
8	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. All in favor.
9	(All board members said aye)
10	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: All right. It passes
11	unanimously. Thank you so much for really a great
12	tutorial.
13	MS. WHITE: Oh, great.
14	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: I'm really glad to see such
15	great progress on this.
16	MS. WHITE: Great. Thank you. And sorry about
17	the numbers, not having them to you till today, those are
18	the wrong slide set so.
19	BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Understand. Thanks.
20	All right. I believe that brings us to public
21	comment. Do we have any members of the public who want to
22	comment?
23	MR. BARTRIDGE: Any members on the phone?

```
/ / /
1
 2
 3
    / / /
               BOARD MEMBER GOLD: Anybody on the phone? Okay.
 4
 5
        All right. Hearing none, we are adjourned. Thank you
 6
 7
    everybody for coming.
                       (Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)
8
9
                                --000-
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	_
	ı
	ı
	ı
1	ı
	ı
2	
3	
_	
4	
_	
5	
)	